

RECAP

Oregon Geographic Information Council



Meeting Date: October 29, 2020

Time: 1:00pm – 4:00pm

Location: Virtual, per EO 20-03 and EO 20-12

Member Attendees: Jeff Frkonja, Metro (Chair); Tom Rohlfing, Marion County Assessor; Colleen Miller, City of Bend; Brandt Melick, City of Springfield; Molly Earle, Gartrell Group; Patrick Gronli, PGE; Rep. Mike Nearman, Oregon Legislature; Lisa Gaines, OSU INR; Jerri Bohard, ODOT; Marguarite Becenti, Umatilla Tribes; Steven Hoffert, OYA

Staff/Observers: Kathryn Helms, EIS-Chief Data Officer; Cy Smith, GEO; Cedric Cooney, ODFW; Rachel Smith, DLCD; John Ruffing, Esri; John Laughery, Esri; Thom York, DOR; Tom Elder, DHS/OHA; Paul Cone, City of Portland; Dorothy Mortenson, OWRD; Phil Smith, ODOT

Introductions & Announcements

- Meeting was called to order by Chair Jeff Frkonja at 1:00pm. With 10 of the 17 voting [OGIC members](#) present, and under modified procedures per Executive Order, a quorum was established for conducting business virtually and taking votes.
- Introductions were made by members and observers.
- One addition to the [agenda](#) was made to add a consent agenda item for approval of two new Framework Implementation Team leads, Arthur Rodriguez with BioScience and Brian Fulfrost with Land Use/Cover. The consent agenda was approved. No announcements made.
- [Minutes](#) from the July meeting were approved without change from the latest posted draft.

Leadership Succession Planning

Several changes were recommended at the July meeting for the OGIC Charter to reflect recommendations by the Leadership Succession Planning Committee, including:

- Length of terms, add the role of Immediate Past Chair
- Add descriptions of each leadership position
- Create an Executive Committee
- Remove detailed membership list
- Changes to standing committees

Steven walked the group through a [presentation](#) that outlined the recommended changes to the [OGIC Charter](#). Those changes were approved by the OGIC Executive Committee prior to this meeting and endorsed by the Council in this October meeting.

During this agenda item, and as per the revised Charter, nominations were made for the Chair and Vice Chair (Chair-elect) positions. Steven Hoffert was nominated and approved as Chair beginning January 1, 2021. Tom Rohlfing was nominated and approved as Vice Chair beginning January 1, 2021. The Vice Chair will take over as Chair the following year.

Objectives and Key Results (OKRs) Recommendations

Molly walked the group through the [Objectives and Key Results](#) (OKRs) for the six month period that started at the July OGIC meeting. There were a few metrics to further identify with some additional research by the Performance Management Committee since the July meeting. Those metrics are presented in green font in the OKR slides linked above. The Executive Committee reviewed and

approved the new metrics. Motion made to accept the recommended OKRs, with the new metrics for several of the Key Results. Motion approved.

Cy provided a brief status report on each Key Result as Molly walked through the OKRs. At the mid-point of the OKR cycle, the following report was provided:

OKR 1: A survey has been developed by OSU/INR that includes questions related to the baseline metric on how much the Framework data is being accessed and used. Survey will be released in a few days and open until at least the end of the year. GEO staff have been working closely with DOR staff to understand the issues that occur with non-standardized tax lot data coming from several counties.

OKR 2: No progress yet, some progress will be made during next quarter.

OKR 3: Two new members of OGIC have been appointed. A third potential member was rejected by the Governor's Office to take the AOC seat. A data governance process study has been undertaken with ODOT, Metro, LCOG, City of Portland, Washington County, Lane County related specifically to roads data. That study will be completed during next quarter.

OKR 4: Tom Rohlfing has taken the lead on communicating with one of the five counties that don't share tax lot data, to understand why and help them understand why data sharing is so important. The knowledge gained from that communication will be used to make progress with the other four counties. No progress made yet on the communication packet related to importance of data sharing.

OKR 5: Work has been ongoing with the stakeholders to further refine the descriptions of the four data development evaluation projects. Work to improve data access necessary for those projects will happen in the next quarter.

Point made that the cycle for these 5 OKRs ends at the January OGIC meeting. The targets will be reset as appropriate, new key results may be defined, etc., and carried forward to the July 2021 OGIC meeting. Those OKRs will be used to inform legislative committees as needed during the upcoming session. As such, it will be necessary for the Performance Management Committee to begin work soon to bring OKR recommendations to OGIC during the January 2021 meeting.

The Performance Management Committee proposed at the July meeting to extend the OKR process to several of the OGIC subordinate committees or work groups, the Council agreed, and that work has been done. Cy walked the Council through the newly established OKRs for the [Technical Advisory Committee](#) and the [Framework Implementation Team Leads](#). Those are quarterly OKRs and the cycle begins at this meeting, so they will be reported out at the January OGIC meeting. The GIS Program Leads also worked on OKRs, but their work is incomplete, so their first cycle will likely begin at the January OGIC meeting.

OGIC Legislative Recommendation

Kathryn indicated that the POP funding request from the Chief Data Officer that includes the OGIC request has now been included in the DAS Agency budget request and is tentatively on track to be included in the Governor's Recommended Budget. She has heard that several of the Governor's advisors are advocating for it to be included in the GRB. Jeff provided a brief summary of the OGIC funding request elements, including the GEOHub secure data sharing portal and the four data development and sharing evaluation projects, which include wildfire response & mitigation, workforce partnerships support, elections administration improvement, and Covid-19 economic recovery support.

Jeff led us through a discussion of next steps, which will mostly involve outreach, engagement, and advocacy. He provided a brief report on what has happened thus far. Strategy thus far has been to reach out to communities of users that will benefit most from the secure data sharing portal and data development for the four projects. Jeff has been authorized to use the Metro lobbyist to advise him on how to proceed. The lobbyist suggested a letter to the Governor advocating for inclusion in the GRB,

signed by as many stakeholders as possible, to be followed by a similar letter to the Legislature. That has been initiated for the Governor's letter.

Jeff, Steven and Tom will meet with the co-Chairs of JLCIMT on Nov. 10 to educate them on the request/recommendation. Steven has set up a meeting with the ODF leadership to educate them about our wildfire project and the request/recommendation. Dave Stuckey has set up a meeting with OEM leadership to educate them about the wildfire project, as well. There have also been some discussions with various stakeholders for the workforce and elections projects. More on the Covid recovery project later in the agenda. We need, however, more stakeholder communications and more stakeholders engaged in the advocacy process.

Jeff showed the two page document drafted as [talking points](#) for use with partners and stakeholders. Kathryn mentioned that we should not proceed too far down the path with legislative advocacy until we know the POP is in the GRB. She also mentioned that the JLCIMT is not a funding committee. Rep. Nearman indicated that he is on JLCIMT and on the General Govt. Subcommittee of Ways & Means, and he thinks we would be wise to make a presentation to JLCIMT, as well as General Govt. Subcommittee regarding the POP and OGIC's recommendation. GRB is due to be finalized first week of December. Kathryn said she isn't aware of any requests from the Legislature for presentations from OGIC or CDO at this point, and it's the CIO's practice to wait until such presentations are requested.

Feedback on the two pager: Point made to update the talking points to clearly add the Covid economic recovery project.

Next steps: Need more folks on the Resource Working Group to help with engagement and advocacy. Tom Rohlfig, Lisa Gaines volunteered to help find advocacy contacts. Point made that next steps are primarily focused on finding the right organizations and people within those organizations to support our funding request. Point made that organizations should be asked to include OGIC funding request in their list of legislative priorities. Question asked about how to interact with Legislature during the upcoming special session: Rep. Nearman suggested it would be a good opportunity to engage individual lawmakers, but there wouldn't likely be an opportunity within the Session.

Suggestions for contacts:

- Someone who is in the districts of the Ways & Means Chairs; Use lobbyists that work for various OGIC member organizations if possible
- AOC is a key organization to gain support from initially, which will prompt others to come on board
- OEMA leadership should be targeted, they will likely be supportive
- User groups would be good supporters, individual cities, counties, utilities, etc
- Federal agencies could be supportive, Tom Carlson indicated they could provide letters of support from USGS Core Science Systems and possibly from USGS State Liaisons; FEMA could be another good supporter

Possibility raised about doing live demos in the Capitol for legislators during regular Session. Tom mentioned multiple requests he got from his Sheriff for tax lot data to support wildfire response for evacuations and looking for victims. Cy mentioned DEQ looking for tax lot data to help them do their work to clean up hazardous chemicals in garages of destroyed homes. They couldn't get the data easily from some counties. Both groups and many others were scrambling to find data in the midst of a disaster. GEOHub will help alleviate that problem.

Covid-19 Economic Recovery Initiative

Jeff summarized the activities on the Covid economic recovery project as one of the evaluation projects we are using to evaluate how GEOHub would potentially serve as a valuable resource for

securely sharing data between public bodies. The Council agreed at the July meeting to adopt the Metro Covid economic recovery project as the fourth evaluation project for GEOHub evaluation, along with wildfire mitigation, workforce partnership, and election administration. The first question such a project might help answer is whether there is a business need for such a resource. The second question is whether such a project would help advance OGIC's mission.

Jeff's group at Metro is leading a Covid economic recovery project in their region. For example, Greater Portland, Inc needs a data resource to help determine where to expend the funds they have to help with economic recovery. That data comes from a lot of stakeholder sources, so a need for a centralized portal is great. The conversation in the metro area started at the regional disaster preparedness organization, which is a five county partnership authorized by an intergovernmental agreement that covers the counties of Multnomah, Clackamas, Washington, Columbia and Clark. The state and the region have stood up Covid response web tools that have proven to be very effective. For recovery, the region has established four topic teams: economy/workforce; housing; education; health. The metro region's project may serve as a model or template at a broader scale, either statewide or in other regions in the state.

The Metro project is focused on building back better than before, using an equity lens. They started with a needs assessment with executive support from all the pertinent stakeholders, including community based organizations. They have pivoted to prepare a project vision for executive leadership. The topic teams have been asked to identify what they need that a regional data product could provide. They are hoping to complete this vision and needs assessment before the end of the year. Unfortunately, Oregon is not nearly as far along as other states, like Washington, in formally defining economic recovery objectives. The data folks in Oregon are farther along in determining needs than the business folks at this point. Metro has established a technical team that started on a needs assessment with the business topic teams, but has now pivoted to implementation of a technical solution for a user experience, to show the business side what is possible. Vision for the effort will likely include potential technical support that can be offered to the business side, but also the identification of critical data that is missing and the need to invest in developing that data.

Kathryn provided a brief update on what has been going on at the State level related to Covid recovery. She has been working with the Racial Justice Council to identify data sets needed to determine the baselines for policy areas, like homelessness. She will seek to use her office as a convener to bring the right people to the table to make these determinations. She sees an opportunity to use what OGIC is building with GEOHub to help with the work of the Racial Justice Council. The primary focus right now is completing the Governor's Recommended Budget. But moving forward, there will be a serious effort to use data to promote action by identifying existing problems and determining what data we have and what is needed to support addressing those challenges.

Question asked about potential to use CARES Act funding to help with the work of the Metro team on Covid recovery. Jeff said he had been told by his leadership that those funds were intended for people who had been directly harmed.

Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Establishment

Cy provided some information about the need for a Policy Advisory Committee to report to OGIC. He briefly pointed to a [Policy Issues document](#) that OGIC agreed upon and prioritized in 2015. Immediately following the development of that document, the Council's attention was diverted by the data sharing legislation and budget matters. Those issues may not be the same issues the Council would focus on now, but the point is that a PAC would make recommendations on policy matters that the Council should take up and resolve. The Council would prioritize issues and ask for recommendations on possible solutions from the PAC. He proposed the establishment of a PAC. If

such an action is approved, the group would be formed in much the same way the TAC was formed, and they would come back to OGIC with a charter for approval at the next meeting.

Jeff asked what type of person might be appropriate for serving on the PAC. Cy indicated that it would be appropriate to have people who are at a relatively high level within their organization, someone who has policy determination in their job description. The ODOT member of the PAC was the manager of their data group, which included their GIS unit. Other members in the past were IT managers or CIOs for state agencies or local governments.

Kathryn mentioned that there is overlap between policy issues for the OGIC and the CDO. There will be a need to figure out where certain issues should be taken up...is it a geospatial issue or a broader data issue? Jeff mentioned that there will be governance issues once we have GEOHub set up, and that PAC could help with those issues. Brandt agreed with the notion of proportional representation, as we did with the TAC. Jeff asked for clarification as to whether the PAC should be a committee of non-OGIC members, or a subcommittee comprised of OGIC members who make decisions that are then endorsed by the full Council.

Patti asked how the onboarding process for the PAC would work and how quickly they could come up to speed as a body, with the legislative session rapidly approaching. Cy said he thought he could initiate onboarding, but each Council member who nominated a PAC member should also participate in the onboarding to properly reflect their views. Jerri mentioned that we want to carefully consider how we would set up the PAC, that they would be another group of people helping the Council to resolve policy matters, but that the Council will still be the ones making the decisions. She indicated that the policy matters on the table for the PAC would be policy with a lower case 'p'. In other words, the policies would be areas where OGIC decides an appropriate approach that organizations should follow, not Policies that all organizations are mandated to follow.

Jeff asked about the urgency of constituting the PAC. Cy answered that it has been five years since OGIC focused on the policies in the policy issues list. It takes a number of months to stand up a functioning group. Jeff summarized that there seems to be agreement OGIC needs a PAC, but that there isn't a need to have one to one correspondence with OGIC members, and that the PAC will need some guidance about what OGIC's authorization is for resolving policy matters. He suggested to set up a small group to draft the first charter and come back with suggestions for initial recruits and structure for OGIC to respond to at the next meeting. Jerri suggested and Jeff agreed that Cy could do that work and use the Executive Committee as a sounding board, rather than setting up a separate work group for that purpose. A motion to that effect was made by Jerri and unanimously approved.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Report

Phil Smith provided a brief report of the activities and initiation of the TAC. The group now has a web page for their activities and minutes. The group now has a Chair (Phil Smith) and Vice Chair (Myrica McCune). The group will meet quarterly, the month prior to OGIC meetings. At their last meeting, in conjunction with the State GIS Program Leads (GPL) group, they received an update on the State Plane Coordinate System 2022 upgrade that is happening nationally, as well as an update on the OGIC Legislative Recommendation and the TAC's potential role in those projects, and the OGIC OKRs. Still learning how to leverage the knowledge and experience of both GPL and TAC. They will come back to OGIC at their next meeting with a prioritized list of technical issues for OGIC input.

Public comments were made by Steven Hoffert to thank Jeff Frkonja for his two year role as OGIC Chair. Steven said that Jeff will leave us in a much better place than when he started.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm.
Next Meeting - Jan 2021, TBD

DRAFT